

## TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Winfield Lee Martin.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## MEDICAL CORPS

*To be major*

Robert Eugene Bitner

*To be captain*

Thomas Earl Patton

Jay James Palmer

Albert Willard Kuske

Henry Clay Vedder

Walter Joseph Reedy

Leon Joseph Numainville

## DENTAL CORPS

*To be captain*

Charles Sidney Winston

## CHAPLAIN CORPS

*To be major*

Frederick William Hagan

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the alpha and omega, the first and the last, the bright and the morning star, hear our prayer. We pray Thee to make the horizon of our lives broader, remembering that over all, through all, and in all Thou art working. To those whose better natures tremble and are afraid, to those who struggle with poverty and whose labor brings so little comfort and warmth, be Thou a providence unto them. Grant that we may have a deeper conception of the riches of Thy grace. As all creation is yearning and longing to see the manifestation of the sons of God, oh, become a power and a comfort to all those whose noonday is threatened with sunset. Heavenly Father, in this day, with its broken glimpses of light, while the tragical life of the world goes on, grant that the grasping hand of plunder may soon be cut off and the world know that the Christ and not Caesar speaks the final word by which men and nations are to live. Encourage all churches, all schools, and all teachers in their efforts to spread abroad a more vigorous desire for the reformation of morals. We rejoice that Thy mercy is from everlasting to everlasting, and beyond all discordant voices there is true peace and unwearying toil. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 5, 1940, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution vesting the chairman of the inaugural committee with authority to determine the location of stands along the inaugural parade route.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3729. An act for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby.

## SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. COOPER administered the oath of office to the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK].

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with civil-service legislation as it applies to Capitol Hill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the book written by our colleague the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], *Tales From Buffalo Land*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway Conference at Detroit on December 5, and to include therein a letter or an address read by Mr. Berle, which was written by President Roosevelt, and also to include an address by Mr. Berle, Assistant Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

## THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have heard much adverse criticism during the last few days on the floor of the House concerning the statement of the chairman of the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities that he proposed to ask for a 2-year extension of life for the committee and an appropriation of \$1,000,000. As a member of that committee, I am concerned over this criticism and want to make my position clear as to the future of our committee and the appropriation that should be requested for the continuation of its work.

I agree with the chairman that in view of conditions that obtain in this Nation today the committee should be continued on the basis of a 2-year program. In my opinion, however, our committee will not authorize its chairman to ask for an appropriation of \$1,000,000, but will, instead, instruct him to ask for a reasonably adequate appropriation to carry on the work. I believe necessary expenditures of the committee can and will be granted by the House from time to time as the need arises. To illustrate: I expect to oppose raising the debt limit to sixty or sixty-five billion dollars at one jump, because I believe it is unwise to make this vast sum available for spending at one time. I prefer to support a program of increasing the debt limit two or three billion dollars at a time as the need arises, so that the Congress can exercise its particular function of keeping a tight hold upon the public purse strings. This, in my opinion, would also be a safe and sane procedure to apply to future appropriations for the Dies committee. [Applause.]

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including President Woodrow Wilson's call to sea for the benefit of the World War veterans of the United States merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

## THE LATE GLENN R. GRISWOLD

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I come to you this morning advising you of the death of a former Member of this House, one of the very best friends

I had in Indiana, the Honorable Glenn Griswold, of Peru, Ind., who died very suddenly last Thursday evening.

Mr. Griswold was known by most of the Members of this body, having served from the Seventy-second to the Seventy-fifth Congresses, inclusive. Indiana has lost a very distinguished son, a man who believed in the rights of all American citizens, and I know that you have likewise lost a very good friend.

Mr. Griswold came to Congress well equipped, having practiced law for a number of years in Peru, Ind., where he later became its city attorney in the years 1922 to 1925. Later he was prosecuting attorney of Miami County and was a member of the Indiana Railroad Commission.

During his service in this body he was a very valuable member of important committees, particularly the Labor Committee and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. His firm conviction that every person held inalienable rights as free men prompted him to take an important part in the development of legislation affecting both the man who toils and former members of the service establishments.

Mr. Griswold was admired for his forthrightness, his ability as a debater, and for the sincere conviction which he always expressed on matters of moment. His voice has now been stilled, but his memory and his spirit will live long after him. I know that I bespeak the sentiments of all of his former colleagues when I publicly offer to his gracious widow our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and regret that I learned of the death of Hon. Glenn R. Griswold, late of Indiana, who served with me in the Congress of the United States during the Seventy-second to the Seventy-fifth terms, inclusive.

Former Congressman Griswold was an earnest, sincere gentleman, very capable, and a man who looked after the interests of his district in a painstaking, untiring way.

Mr. Griswold entered life in humble circumstances. It was through diligence and work that he arose finally to the position of a good attorney with a good, lucrative practice in Peru, Ind., from which place he was elected to the Congress of the United States. Having followed various occupations from cowpuncher to railroader, he continued during his life and through his terms in Congress to hold his union labor cards. Among his many fine traits, he had one splendid trait which was outstanding. He never forgot the people in the lowly walks of life. His ear was ever open to them and he continued to the end to earnestly work for the uplift and the well-being and the welfare of those who toil and those who earn their living by their toil and their labor. The man who can walk in low estate and who can continue to implement and help those in low estate after he has risen above their standards and who can continue to have the well-being of those at heart whom he once trod with while in lower estate is a man and a man worth while.

In the death of Mr. Griswold his district and State and the Nation have lost a valued public servant.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include in connection therewith certain excerpts from newspapers and letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes following any other special order that may have been granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem written by Horace C. Carlisle, of Alabama, who has just achieved the distinction of threescore years and ten and has prepared a salutatory to that event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

#### ENTRY OF UNITED STATES INTO WAR

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, coming to Washington, I had the good fortune to read the Chicago Daily Tribune, and also early this morning, when I could not sleep, I read the Ohio State Journal. In each of those papers were startling statements concerning our getting into war. One was by the eminent Cardinal O'Connell, of the city of Boston, in which he sounded a note of alarm. Likewise, in the Ohio State Journal was an article by William E. Barrett. I ask unanimous consent that those two articles may be placed in the RECORD, so that America may be informed. Everyone should know what those great men have to say on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement from the Reader's Digest, December 1940, entitled "Hitler's Branch Offices in the U. S. A."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### HITLER'S BRANCH OFFICES IN THE U. S. A.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw every Member's attention to an article appearing in the Reader's Digest, in the December 1940 number, entitled "Hitler's Branch Offices in the U. S. A." I would draw it to the particular attention of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and ask that they read this and see if what appears to be this overgenerous agreement with Adolph Hitler's government may not be canceled or modified in accordance with safety for this country.

I ask every Member to read this in order that he may know how diplomatic immunity is being exploited. How they send their secret Nazi messages, which are exempt and free from inspection. Whenever any of these spies or saboteurs or subversive agents are caught they are always able to plead diplomatic immunity, in which they are valiantly supported by the German diplomatic service.

This is indicated and proven in the case of the Nazi courier, Herbert Hoehne, at Los Angeles, wherein a trunk, the contents of which were said to have been suspected to include military secrets. This man was caught with no diplomatic pass, but the trunk had upon it a diplomatic seal. This trunk was taken away from our officials when a member of Fritz Wiedemann's staff rushed up with diplomatic credentials and demanded the trunk, flying it on to Mexico, and Hoehne was finally released.

Automobile numbers were checked at the bund camp in Andover, N. J. When their drills were over, five members returned to jobs at the Picatinny Arsenal, largest in the Nation;



twelve to the National Guard; three to the Hercules Powder Plant in Kenville; and three to jobs as engineers in New Jersey's biggest powder plant. The Kenville plant was blown up 2 months later, killing 52. In the same week, Picatinny Arsenal was blown up, killing two more. I am taking this up with the State Department, and I ask that every Member of this House read this and take what he considers appropriate action. Here are some facts you cannot overlook.

[From Reader's Digest for December 1940—Condensed from Current History and Forum]

#### HITLER'S BRANCH OFFICES, U. S. A.

(By Albert Grzesinski, with Charles E. Hewitt, Jr.)

Amid all the excited discussion of Hitler's "fifth column" in the United States, the mainspring of his sabotage machine, gigantic as it is, and in plain sight of everyone, is overlooked.

I refer to his quite brazen exploitation of the international courtesy known as diplomatic immunity. Under this century-old tradition, diplomats enjoy unique privileges. Their baggage and mail are exempt from inspection. They may not even be tried for murder, nor their houses searched with warrants. In return, diplomats have traditionally behaved with great circumspection.

Then came Hitler, and turned the convenient tradition to his own uses. He sent secret agents abroad with diplomatic immunity to mask their operations. This perversion of international decency put his chief spies, saboteurs, and their files beyond interference.

In America Hitler is particularly fortunate. Under a special treaty with Germany—the most generous in the State Department's library—scores of Nazi officials here enjoy honors no less exceptional than ambassadors. Diplomatic immunity is extended to families of the embassy staffs and to all consular subordinates right down to the janitor—even to "as yet unlisted workers" at the 29 consulates.

The State Department, clinging to the old honorable diplomacy tradition, does not even possess a list of all Germans and their families and servants benefiting from immunities. It has no central file of diplomatic passports. So Nazi propagandists, spies, and trouble-makers are swarming over the United States under United States protection.

In the 3 years I have been in America I have seen Nazi diplomatic representation trebled here. Consuls' duties are supposedly confined to aiding their nationals in traveling and business; and German-American trade is now almost nonexistent. Yet in New York the number of officials in the German consulate has risen from 38 to 116. This office has the further frank impertinence to maintain a political department—a thing unheard of in pre-Hitler consular services. The roster of San Francisco's consulate, headed by Hitler's friend, Fritz Wiedemann, has jumped from 8 to 28.

In Philadelphia German consular work was formerly done by an American lawyer in his spare time. But since the war Philadelphia has a new consul, no less than Erich Windels, previously chief Nazi diplomat in Canada. In the spring of 1938 a Dr. Gerhard arrived from Germany to unite all Fascist organizations in Canada under Nazi leadership. He began lavish distribution of cash and literature to that end. The first circulars exhorted all Fascist-minded Canadians to communicate with Gerhard—at Windels' office. Gerhard finally got out of Canada ahead of the police; diplomatic immunity prevented action against Windels. Now the City of Brotherly Love is honored by the presence of Windels in charge of the consulate there—assisted by two other Germans of consular rank.

And what are these consuls with their enlarged staffs up to? Consider the notorious case of Fritz Wiedemann in San Francisco, with his unique powers over all German diplomats in Central and South America. In April last year, when a would-be dictator named Busch seized power for a time in Bolivia, Wiedemann was hailed in the Reich press for "this first glorious result of his work in America." His formal assignment, beyond nazification of weak nations, is to foment all possible friction between the United States and Latin America. Hitler himself wired Wiedemann congratulations "on your fine work in defeating repeal of the Neutrality Act," which is close to an all-time high in effrontery.

Baron Edgar von Spiegel, a naval officer who is consul at New Orleans, has brazenly offered American universities subsidies to remove anti-Nazi professors. He recently warned American businessmen that they would see no contracts from Germany after the war if they continued to aid England now. The State Department did not even administer a personal rebuke, and throughout South America his unpunished insolence was highlighted as evidence of inability to cope with the Nazis.

As recently as January 4, 1939, the present vice consul in New York City, Dr. Friedhelm Draeger, was signing letters as "National Leader of the Nazi Party in America." This meant that he was actual führer of the bund, the storm troop camps, and the seditious newspapers in the United States at the same time that he was an accredited diplomat.

Now, the bund in America is part of a better mass machine of spies, saboteurs, and cash contributors than the Nazis have had in any country in Europe. Its membership list has never been surrendered despite Government subpoenas and energetic F. B. I. investigation. The bund claims it has no roster or financial records. This is true; both are kept at the consulates.

Every one of the bund's 40,000 members is, by regulation, an American citizen who nevertheless renews an oath of loyalty to Hitler and the greater German Reich each year on April 20, the

führer's birthday. The founder of the bund, Dr. Ignatz Griebel, was convicted of espionage in Federal court in 1938. The court declared in pronouncing sentence that Griebel was "chief of the biggest spy ring ever found in the United States in peacetime." The ring had delivered to Germany, among other data, the plans of America's newest destroyers, a coding machine just purchased by the Navy, and the blueprints of 12 new airplane types. One of the bund spies sent to Leavenworth was in active United States Army service; two of those convicted had been officers. Griebel himself escaped to Germany. He was at that time a lieutenant in the United States Army Reserve.

License plates were checked at the bund camp in Andover, N. J., this summer. When their Nazi drills were over 5 members were found to be returning to jobs at Picatinny Arsenal, largest in the Nation; 12 to positions in the National Guard; 3 to the Hercules Powder plant in Kenville; and 3 to jobs as engineers in New Jersey's biggest power plant. Two months later New Jersey rocked beneath one of the greatest explosions in America's industrial history when the Kenville plant went up. Fifty-two died there. Within the same week a blast at the Picatinny Arsenal killed 2 more. The F. B. I. is still investigating.

How the abuse of diplomatic immunity works may be seen from the recent incident when the F. B. I. swooped on a Nazi courier, Herbert Hoehne, as he boarded a plane in Los Angeles with a trunkload of secret documents. He carried no diplomat's pass, but the trunk had a diplomatic seal. The contents were suspected to include American military secrets. The State Department in Washington, notified by phone, was still hesitating to violate the sacred seals when a member of Wiedemann's staff rushed up. Warned from the airport, he arrived with diplomatic credentials, and, demanding the trunk, flew it on to Mexico. The United States released Hoehne. In return the German Embassy was kind enough not to make formal protest about interference with its mail.

American branches of all German businesses have enlarged as mysteriously as the consulates despite complete throttling of their trade by the blockade. The Hapag-Lloyd steamship lines have increased their staff in New York and taken over a whole new floor in Chicago. The German Railways information office (what Americans travel in Germany these days?) still spends its prewar budget of \$160,000 a year. Amerop Travel Service has moved from a modest office to a complete floor on Madison Avenue with 60 employees. Public records last year showed it had 20 branches in New York State alone. The confidential files of German business houses are carefully kept out of harm's way—on the sacrosanct grounds of the nearest consulate.

And Hitler is also sheltering his outright propagandists over here under diplomatic immunity. Prince Kurt zur Lippe, de luxe propagandist lecturer, who officially records his address as "care of German consul, San Francisco," carries a diplomatic passport issued back in 1926 in Berlin. The new Nazi commissar of Hitler's public propaganda center in the United States, the German library of information, has a visa issued normally to "educators of repute, from whose teachings America will benefit."

On September 14 this German library of information, with a mailing record of over 3,000,000 items since the war began, was haled into court in New York for failure to register as a business. It had repeatedly disclaimed any connection with Hitler's government. But now that it was in danger, the German Embassy in Washington hurriedly certified that "the library's staff (over 30 men) are all employees of the Embassy and thus immune to American law."

And this branch office of Hitler-Germany, as crucial as the bund, remains unknown to the American public—the Arbeitsfront (labor front). It has still more members and collects more important dues; its membership list and books are also nonexistent.

The Arbeitsfront is a perfect sabotage switchboard in time of war or crisis. In 3 years of industrious research it has located every reliable worker of German descent—from engineer to chemist to laborer—in American industry. With German thoroughness and Nazi ruthlessness the Arbeitsfront has applied the pressure necessary to insure reliability.

The essence of secret policing and the backbone of any large-scale treason organization is voluminous and accurate reports. The 300 crack Gestapo agents here know more about many American companies than their executives know themselves. These huge files are, perforce, kept in the consulates, locked against the F. B. I. by immunity.

The use of diplomatic privilege as a prelude to sabotage and treachery was an essential part of Hitler's technique in his lightning conquest of Europe. The same tactics have been going on in half a dozen South American countries. Plans for armed revolution were seized in Montevideo this June. The local bund chief confessed they were in his own handwriting. The Reich did not apologize. Instead, the German Minister promptly dissolved the bund and took over its properties in trust—barring police from seizing records, cash, or membership lists by virtue of the Legation's diplomatic immunity.

German sabotage in the United States during the last war was run by two gentlemen amateurs, von Papen and von Rintelen, with no previous organization and with meager funds. Yet 34 factories were bombed, 6 railroad terminals and utilities knocked out, and 36 freight ships blown up.

From my experience in German police work and my close study of "fifth column" activities in Europe I know that Hitler's abuse of diplomatic immunity is a vital part of his aim to paralyze America. He isn't trusting to amateurs this time. When der Tag comes again to the United States it will bring, as in so many unsuspecting European nations, wholesale bombings and confusing broadcasts,

destruction of factories and disruption of railroads, stalling of battleships, and break-down of army equipment. That is the way the Nazi high command has planned it, with the world's finest organizing brains to prepare each detail. Hitler means it when he says repeatedly, "America cannot count in this war." One bund chief recently boasted, "America is the easiest country Hitler has tackled yet. We will never have to outfight the Americans; we have outsmarted them already."

Yet it may not be too late for America to defend herself against this undeclared war which Hitler is waging through his diplomats. A few Americans are alive to the peril. A vigorous campaign conducted by the New York Post against Consul Friedrich Ried, promoted to New York City after flagrant "fifth column" work in Brazil, led to his recall. Other newspapers have helped expose the danger. Dorothy Thompson's all-out campaign to "send the Nazi consuls home now" is the most hopeful sign of all. But it will take a concerted drive rather than occasional exposures to make the unsuspecting American public realize the extent and determination of the disguised forces pitted against the United States today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Record a speech entitled "What Are We Fighting For?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by inserting a compilation of information concerning veterans of the World War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Most Important Problem Now Confronting America, and to include certain clippings and quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### COMMERCE WITH GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with all the press reports we have these days pertaining to purchases by Great Britain and her need of financial assistance from the people of the United States, I find from the Department of State Press Release No. 500, dated November 28, 1940, that the actual exports of arms and ammunition and implements of war to the entire British Empire during the first 10 months of this year amounted to only \$165,580,960; and from the Treasury statement of July 31, 1940, the British war debt in default to the people of the United States of America is \$5,651,792,000; that the total exports of all categories to Great Britain alone in the first 10 months was \$134,960,000; and that the total export licenses issued in the first 10 months of 1940 amounted to only \$591,341,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to expand on the facts in connection with these purchases and shipments and to include two very brief tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Actual exports of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Great Britain and the British Empire during the 10 months ending Oct. 31, 1940—Total exports 10 months*

Australia.....	\$9,605,022
Bermuda.....	10,638
British Guiana.....	5,418
British Honduras.....	270
Canada.....	18,508,159
Great Britain and Ireland.....	134,962,563
India.....	89,462
Kenya Colony.....	618
New Zealand.....	189,898
Southern Rhodesia.....	112,316
Union of South Africa.....	2,095,696
Total.....	165,580,060

Total licenses issued 10 months of 1940 amount to \$591,341,000 worth of arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the British Isles.

Canadian licenses were \$44,500,000 in the same period, of which only \$18,508,159 were delivered.

*Exports of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Great Britain, first 10 months of 1940, by categories*

Total exports, all categories.....	\$134,962,563
Category I (2) machine guns.....	10,307,054
Category I (4) ammunition.....	16,390,561
Category III (1) airplanes assembled, unassembled....	60,601,794
Category V (3) aircraft engines.....	19,768,679
Category VII (1) propellant powders.....	8,198,976
Category V (2) propellers, air screws, etc.....	5,628,996

All other categories make up the balance of \$134,962,563. Great Britain has not purchased any war vessels or tanks in the 10 months in which deliveries were made.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would not lead anyone to believe that what Great Britain or the British Empire has done heretofore in the way of placing orders with us for goods is any yardstick for what those countries may find necessary to do in the future. At the same time, until I saw these figures I was working under the wrong impression, and I personally feel that millions of our people are thoroughly uninformed on these matters. In talking with a British subject only last week I pointed out to him that I felt we should require security on such loans as the United States might make to any foreign country, whether it be Great Britain or some other belligerent or country at peace with other nations. It is very clear that the way the situation is now shaping up the people of the United States and the Members of Congress will have to make some very far-reaching decisions on this question within the near future. I believe that it is reasonable to say that the United States will be forced, by events now shaping themselves, to decide between becoming an economic colony of Great Britain again or the official receiver of probably a bankrupt British Empire. I say this for several reasons, and among them I would point out that England is laboring under a terrific first World War debt, in addition to being forced to carry the burden of the present great conflict while her opponents have long ago repudiated or canceled out, through inflation, the war debts created in 1914 to 1920. It is not reasonable to assume that Britain can work out from under her old war debt and the burdens of the present conflict and retain a whole economic fabric and do it unaided. Appeals are now being made to the United States in a most unusual manner, and the Bank of England, with its powerful forces of education and propaganda, along with its friends and connections in the United States, will go a very long way to have our fiscal policies shaped toward tremendous assistance for the British Empire in all of its undertakings. Speaking very plainly and bluntly—and matters of this scope are subject to such words—I have no hesitancy in saying that those in charge of British propaganda will compliment, cajole, and praise us to the skies until we are thoroughly in, or even perhaps until the conflict has been won or lost, and then, having passed that point, we will be the scum of the international crowd. We should do one of two things if we are to go along with financing these operations—either make our contributions in the form of a gift with our eyes wide open or make loans with full security in the way of investments Britain holds in our industries, against our units of government, or, by giving us collateral represented by empire holdings like, for instance, the British West Indies. Then when the war is over and the settlements are to be made, we do the best we can under the circumstances. Every student of this question is well aware of the fact that the administration is lining up every force of government toward the support of the administration's policy covering international affairs and our attitude toward the present war in Europe. It will be a very easy matter for our people to overlook the importance of our retaining foreign trade which operates independent of war orders. If our industries are to be geared to the wartime demands of England, and if we are to build our economy on that demand, permitting British colonies to largely maintain export peacetime trade for the benefit of the Empire, we can rest assured that when orders for armaments, ammunitions, and implements of war cease to flow to our factories there will be a financial and economic



collapse in the United States that will tax every thread in our democratic fabric. It will then remain to be seen whether or not our democracy can survive—and there is little reason for us to assume that it can under the stress that will then be with us. England and every totalitarian country in the world knows this to be true. Let me ask, What world power now operating will worry about our economic and social troubles? What world power has worried about us the last 50 years insofar as helping us was concerned? What country came to our rescue in the so-called dark days of 1929–33 which we hear so much about? What country will support our tottering economic structure if we forfeit our peacetime export trade, lend our substance to other countries, build our debt, double and treble our taxes, regiment our people, and attempt to assume the burdens of all the world when we have such a deplorable mess here at home? Only the other day one of the administration officials appeared before a committee here in Washington and pointed out that 45,000,000 of our people were undernourished. The farm people know very well what has happened to their export markets, what is taking place in the way of advancing prices on the goods they must purchase, and the white-collar class of workers know that they are being caught between increasing local and Federal taxes and a potential collapse in our economy which will again wipe out their equities. We can well afford, Mr. Speaker, to weigh well the blandishments of other nations at this particular moment. After all, there is an internal economy of our people that has not yet been placed on a firm foundation, and it is with such we shall have to deal in the years to come.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the *RECORD* a short editorial from the New York Times and a statement by Dr. McCracken, president of Vassar College, on the war situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* three times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and to include therein a short table discussed in the remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by the city editor of the Lima News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## DR. B. L. PURSIFULL ET AL.

Mr. EBERHARTER, from the Committee on Claims, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 658), for the relief of the estate of Dr. B. L. Pursifull, Grace Pursifull, Eugene Pursifull, Ralph Pursifull, Bobby Pursifull, and Dora Little, for printing in the *RECORD*.

## CONFERENCE REPORT—DR. B. L. PURSIFULL ET AL.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill, H. R. 658, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a unanimous report of the conferees, as I understand.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is a unanimous report of the conferees; yes.

Mr. MICHENER. In view of the fact there are a few here, will the gentleman explain in a brief way what the bill is and what it does?

Mr. EBERHARTER. For that purpose I should like to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] who introduced the measure, and who knows more about it than I really do myself.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was in June 1937, that Dr. Pursifull, his wife, three small sons, and a Mrs. Little, were in an automobile driving on a public highway in Jackson County, Ky., near McKee, when a C. C. C. truck crossed the road and demolished Dr. Pursifull's car. The occupants of the car, whom I have named, were badly injured. It turned out later that the driver of the C. C. C. truck admitted to being drunk when he was driving the truck; and information of his condition was brought to the attention of the foreman before the driver left the C. C. C. camp. It is one of those cases of clear and willful negligence.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I now recall the case; it comes back to me. The bill was given careful consideration by the House and passed unanimously.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. What was done to the bill in the Senate that caused it to go to conference?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. These people, as I say, were badly injured, and Dr. Pursifull died within a year. Dr. Pursifull was a young physician making from \$6,000 to \$10,000 a year. The hospital bills alone for these people amounted to \$2,000. The House allowed \$8,300. The Senate cut it down to \$5,100, and the conference committee agreed on \$6,025.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It allows about \$2,100 or \$2,200 less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

## CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 658) entitled "An Act for the relief of the estate of Doctor B. L. Pursifull, Grace Pursifull, Eugene Pursifull, Ralph Pursifull, Bobby Pursifull, and Dora Little", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$1,681.84" insert "\$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$1,138.65" insert "\$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$182" insert "\$200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$106" insert "\$125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$1,096" insert "\$1,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$961" insert "\$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,  
ROBERT RAMSPECK,  
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
JOHN TOWNSEND,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate

to the bill (H. R. 658) for the relief of the estate of Dr. B. L. Pursifull, Grace Pursifull, Eugene Pursifull, Ralph Pursifull, Bobby Pursifull, and Dora Little, submit the following statement in explanation to the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill as it passed the House provided for the payment of \$2,500 to the estate of Dr. B. L. Pursifull, \$2,245 to Grace Pursifull, \$250 to the legal representative of Ralph Pursifull, \$250 to the legal representative of Eugene Pursifull, and \$1,850 to the legal representative of Bobby Pursifull, each of whom are infants under the age of 21 years, and \$1,200 to Dora Little, all residing at McKee, Jackson County, Ky., for damages sustained on account of bodily injuries received by them on June 6, 1937, when the car in which they were riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck assigned to the Forest Service.

When the bill was considered by the Senate and passed they reduced the amount payable to \$1,681.84 to the estate of Dr. B. L. Pursifull, \$1,138.65 to Grace Pursifull, \$182 to the legal representative of Ralph Pursifull, \$106 to the legal representative of Eugene Pursifull, and \$1,096 to the legal representative of Bobby Pursifull, each of whom are infants under the age of 21 years, and \$961 to Dora Little.

At the conference the conferees agreed to the amounts as follows: \$2,000 to the estate of Dr. B. L. Pursifull, \$1,500 to Grace Pursifull, \$200 to the legal representative of Ralph Pursifull, \$125 to the legal representative of Eugene Pursifull, and \$1,200 to the legal representative of Bobby Pursifull, each of whom are infants under the age of 21 years, and \$1,000 to Dora Little.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,  
ROBERT RAMSPECK,  
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THANKSGIVING DAY

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I realize there is a big war going on and that we are studying a great many other things, but our plans are to live and get along right here in the United States of America. Today there is something I want to bring to your attention.

Last year a little matter came up about which the people got somewhat exercised. It concerned our Thanksgiving. The President issued a proclamation fixing Thanksgiving on a date different from that on which it is usually observed, and some people reported actual hardships—slight, to be sure. It occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we could adopt a resolution—and I have one I expect to introduce next Thursday; I should like to talk with you about it awhile first, however—if we could get a resolution fixing Thanksgiving in the District of Columbia the first Thursday following the third Sunday in each November, that that would put it far enough back and far enough forward and fix it close enough to operate and not leave anything to fly up and hit us in the face any more. I believe, if we could do that in the District of Columbia, that it would follow through all over the country. For example, let us see: November 19 would then be the earliest day on which Thanksgiving could fall, and Thursday, November 25, the latest date on which it could fall. So I think action on such a resolution would solve the little problem that we have been rocking backward and forward on, and maybe it is of enough importance to bring to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. If I have any unexpired time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say to the gentleman that a resolution touching that subject has already been introduced.

Mr. PATRICK. I am much obliged; if I like it better than mine, I shall support it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### FOREIGN LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there are at the present time in the United States published 1,047 newspapers, periodicals, and magazines which are printed in foreign languages.

I do not accuse the majority of these publications of being against the constituted Government of the United States, but information which I have been studying leads me to believe that far too many of these publications printed in foreign languages are being used for the purpose of an attempted overthrow of the Government of the United States.

We have created a committee which I believe by and large is doing good work, the Dies committee, and I am today asking the committee of this House on un-American activities thoroughly to investigate the publication of these periodicals with a view to perhaps stopping what might become a dangerous situation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### PAN AMERICAN COTTON CONGRESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, after a conference with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], the acting minority leader, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 302 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

#### Senate Joint Resolution 302

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President of the United States is authorized and requested by proclamation or in such manner as he may deem proper to invite all foreign countries and nations to the Pan American Cotton Congress to be held at Memphis, Tenn., during the year 1941, with a request that they participate therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I objected to this bill when it was before the House the other day for the reason that I understood that this was what would amount in the end to another world's fair, or something of that type, where foreign nations would be requested to present exhibits. I cited the fact at that time that in all past instances the Congress had later been confronted with a follow-up resolution appropriating money to carry out the purposes of the original resolution. However, I now understand that the instant resolution only provides for an invitation to attend a convention or a conference, and that this resolution in no sense contemplates a world's fair or anything that approaches it. If this resolution is enacted, it simply means that the President of the United States is authorized to invite these southern republics to attend a cotton convention or conference to be held in Memphis. If this is true, certainly there should be no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that when we passed a resolution inviting foreign countries to attend a similar—you might even call it an exhibition or a fair at Sacramento, Calif., in 1939, commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Sutter's Fort at that place—there was no appropriation asked thereafter from the United States Government; consequently, the gentleman is in error when he says that in all cases appropriations have been asked.

Mr. MICHENER. There are exceptions, of course, to all rules. Maybe I have covered too much territory. I was here when that resolution passed. The gentleman did keep faith with the Congress, as he always does, and for that he is to be complimented. No appropriation was asked for.

Mr. BUCK. I kept faith with the Congress, and that is what I rose to say.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I only regret that this conference is not to be held in Washington where every Member of Congress could attend, especially southern Members.

I want to call attention to the fact that I was one of the Members who opposed what was known as the original Bankhead bill to limit cotton production by law in 1933. The State of Sao Paulo, one of the large cotton-growing States in Brazil, produced only about 100,000 bales of cotton in 1932, the year before the Bankhead law was passed. Since



that law was passed the cotton grown in Sao Paulo alone rose to 1,200,000 bales in 1939. The State of Sao Paulo now produces more cotton than does the State of Mississippi, which is the second largest cotton-growing State in the American Union. I simply want to emphasize the fact that the philosophy of scarcity will not work in a free economy. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### STRIKES IN INDUSTRIES PRODUCING WAR MATERIALS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will recall that recently we had some discussion on the floor of the House with reference to strikes in industries producing war materials and I made the statement then that the Committee on the Judiciary was taking notice of the situation. I am not authorized in what I am about to say to state the judgment or indicate definitely the attitude of the Committee on the Judiciary, but most of the Members of the House I am sure will be interested in the statement which I am about to make.

It is appreciated by the Committee on the Judiciary that the situation is serious. The Committee on the Judiciary earnestly wants to be of practical service in this situation. I believe that all members of the committee agree, and I think the Members of the House agree, that our situation is serious and that now, depending upon how we proceed with reference to this matter, we may unite our people or drive some deep lines of cleavage among our people. We want to avoid the latter. Everyone in this country, however they may feel with regard to it, is conscious of the fact that day by day we appear to be drawing closer to actual contact with the World War.

The House and Senate, supported by the country, voted to subject the young manhood of this country to compulsory military service, taking them away from their homes and their business and to interpose possibly their bodies between this country and those who may become this Government's enemies.

I should like to make this statement, and I am stating that which all the world knows. We are not now adequately prepared to supply these young men with those things necessary for their own protection and for the defense of this country. That is a very serious situation. It is a situation so serious and so far reaching in its possibilities that no person in this country who has any intelligence can fail to recognize, speaking generally, that this people have but one business in America that is relatively of any importance, and that is to make this country secure as far as it is possible to do it.

We do not want to repeat in America the mistakes of France, where manufacturers were concerned for a profit and the operatives were concerned for what they called social gains, slowing up defense preparation while Germany unitedly was preparing for their destruction. When we look across

to the situation in France now we wonder what those manufacturers and their operatives would now give if they had stood together in those hours of great opportunity and made the frontier of France impregnable. What would they now give if they had done that? We do not want to repeat that mistake.

I speak with assurance with regard to the laboring people of my part of the country when I say they are just as patriotic as the people in the offices of the factories, speaking generally. It is my observation, and I have studied people all my life, that people of the same blood and the same environment are the same sort of people, whether they are in the factories or in the offices of the factories. The quicker we learn that and attempt to deal with our problems on that basis the quicker we will get somewhere.

It is unfortunate in America that each group now is looking at its own perfections and looking to see what is wrong with the other fellow. If we would turn the spotlight on ourselves a little bit, it would help solve this situation. That is the first thing for us to try to find out—"What is wrong with me? What is my attitude?" I believe there is some disposition now to do that. I am certain that if we will develop the right sort of leadership here the American people will present to the world as great and as effective a unity as any people have presented in the periods of our history.

I want to make an additional statement. It is my conviction, and I believe you will agree, that unless we do this we cannot win through the difficulties which now confront us. That is all there is to it.

It is a remarkable thing, when we really look at the situation as it is, that an American citizen in this tragic hour in the history of all time will be considering "What advantage can I personally get out of this situation?"—making merchandise out of the deepest interests and vital necessities of a great republic. We have but one business in America today, and that is to save this country as a place where men may remain free. We have just one business that is worth anything. What business do they have now in England and in many other parts of the world? Just one business. If we will attend to that business now, we may not have to go through what they are going through on the other side.

I want to repeat a statement, and I am going to keep on saying it until somebody will agree with me. It is not a matter of mysticism; I do not profess to be psychic, but I believe the facts justify the conclusion that we will be a foolish people if we imagine that we are going to escape the necessity of meeting the test which the other nations of the earth are now being compelled to meet.

The Committee on the Judiciary wants to cooperate with the administrative agencies of the Government. I have here some letters, Mr. Speaker, which I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk now read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOVEMBER 26, 1940.

The Honorable ROBERT H. JACKSON,  
Attorney General of the United States.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House respectfully to inquire if there is any additional legislation necessary and, if so, what, to make as certain as may be that the Government's preparedness program be not interfered with, and particularly that the operation of the manufacturing plants engaged in the production of war materials be not interfered with by such strikes as are now tying up some of these plants. I beg to assure you that the Committee on the Judiciary is anxious to be as helpful as possible in these matters.

I am further directed to ask you to please bring this communication to the attention of the conference which we are advised is to be held at the White House this afternoon with reference to these strikes.

Very respectfully yours,

HATTON W. SUMNERS.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1940.

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SUMNERS: I greatly appreciate the cooperative attitude indicated by the Judiciary Committee of the

House in soliciting our suggestions for legislation to prevent delays in the production of defense materials. It is in line with the fine cooperation from your committee this Department always has in its problems.

The particular situation which precipitated your inquiry has now been solved without additional legislation.

This Department has, as you know, no authority or responsibility in the field of general labor policy. We do not execute or approve any contracts and only become concerned when violation of law or subversive activities are involved, and then we are concerned, not because it is a labor situation but because of the specific violations or activities.

Frankly, I do not feel that our collateral relationship to these labor questions justifies us in making recommendations covering the field of labor relations, which is chiefly committed to other departments.

In view of the fact that primarily responsibility for the procurement of materials is upon the War and Navy Departments and members of the Defense Commission in charge of production and that the matter of labor relations is primarily upon the Department of Labor and the members of the Defense Commission in charge of labor relations, any suggestions from me at this time for legislative action could be nothing more than the intrusion of personal views, more likely to complicate than to solve the problem.

Certainly, in the field of law enforcement, with which this Department is concerned, the present situation in respect of strikes presents no law-enforcement problem that is either novel or out of hand. We will take the liberty of suggesting from time to time certain additional legislation which we feel would be helpful in the field of law enforcement. In this field your committee has given us constant support and where our proposals for legislation have been delayed or defeated it has usually been through no failure of your committee to understand or sympathize with our problems.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. JACKSON,  
Attorney General.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, upon the receipt of that letter from the Attorney General I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the chairman of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may now read this letter and the replies thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOVEMBER 28, 1940.

HON. FRANCES PERKINS,  
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MME. SECRETARY: The Committee on the Judiciary is anxious to be as helpful as possible to the agencies of the Government charged with the responsibility of providing for the national defense, and especially at this time in making certain the uninterrupted operation of manufacturing plants engaged in the production of war materials.

I am, therefore, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House writing to inquire if any additional legislation is needed, and, if so, what, to aid you in the discharge of your responsibilities in the premises.

Very respectfully yours,

HATTON W. SUMNERS.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the Clerk now read the reply of the Secretary of Labor?

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., November 30, 1940.

The Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of November 28, 1940, telling me that your committee is anxious to be as helpful as possible to the agencies of the Government charged with the responsibility of providing for the national defense, particularly with a view to making certain the uninterrupted operation of manufacturing plants engaged in the production of materials. I appreciate the considerate attitude of your committee.

This Department is keenly aware of the importance of keeping open factories handling defense orders. Until the various aspects of the situation have been studied, I am inclined to think that any proposal which I might make to Congress at the present time would be premature.

As soon as the Department has thoroughly studied the matter, I shall be glad to give you a further report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. There is also a reply from the secretary of the Defense Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE  
COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE,  
FEDERAL RESERVE BUILDING,  
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1940.

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Ed Stettinius gave me your letter of November 28, in which you inquire if any additional legislation is needed by the National Defense Commission.

I discussed this matter with the Commission yesterday, and I am authorized to say that at the present time we have no specific suggestions to make for additional legislation. The Commission asked me to say to you that it would appreciate, however, an opportunity to be heard on any proposals that may be made from other sources for legislation affecting national-defense activities.

The Commission also asked me to say to you that it is deeply appreciative of the very considerate attention you have already given to matters affecting it in legislation already passed at this session.

Very sincerely yours,

WM H. McREYNOLDS,  
Secretary.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the committee has received no reply as yet from the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

The Committee on the Judiciary has appointed a subcommittee to get in touch with the agencies and instrumentalities and persons most interested in the keeping open of these factories and to study the whole question, both for the purpose of being immediately helpful, if possible, and for the purpose of being fully advised if it should become necessary for the committee upon its own volition to move in the situation, having in mind that if that necessity should develop the committee would probably have to move very quickly. I make these statements only in order that the House and the country may be advised as to the situation thus far developed.

I believe the Committee on the Judiciary and the Members of the House and the country as a whole are agreed on this one proposition and are willing to give proper consideration and, if possible, relief to anybody aggrieved with reference to any condition which obtains in any of these plants producing the necessities of defense or war, but I do not believe that the country will compromise one iota on the proposition that having subjected its young manhood to the possibilities of compulsory military service, having voted these billions of dollars, that it will be tolerated for one split second that anybody can paralyze the operation of these plants upon which the safety of this Nation may depend. [Applause.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee is most timely and I do feel that he speaks the sentiments of this Congress and the country. I would just like to call attention at this time to the fact that on the west coast and in the northwest country there is a strike going on which we are told is tying up the lumber necessary in the building of the cantonments of this country and 12,000 workers are involved.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. My time is short and I would like to make this statement. The committee wants to avoid any appearance of being officious in this matter. We want to be as helpful as we can in coordinating and bringing about cooperation among all the instrumentalities of government, organized labor, and everybody else who wants to keep these plants open, but we want them kept open.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on the statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Not only does this strike in the Northwest affect the defense housing proposition, it also affects the actual defense industries themselves; for example, the several aircraft factories that are out there are needing lumber to expand their own facilities, to say nothing of lumber for crating purposes, and that is one of the sources or the prime source for this material. That is, indeed, a defense industry of the first magnitude.

[Here the gavel fell.]



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it certainly will be encouraging to the people of the country to learn of the statement of the gentleman from Texas. It is all very well, and it is very generous for the Committee on the Judiciary to ask the advice of the departments of the Government for suggestions as to what should be done; but, after all, Congress is here, and there is a presumption—however faint it may be—that we are qualified and able to deal with some of these problems ourselves.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just 1 minute?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I make the observation that while Congress is qualified to enact laws, Congress cannot deal with this problem. It is an administrative job.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, as I understand it—and with all due deference to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]—the Attorney General having advised us that he does not need any laws to end the trouble, it certainly cannot be an administrative or an executive problem. He says that we have law enough, and yet this thing continues. Now, we must assume that the executive department is doing everything that can be done or could be done, and that, therefore, the fault lies in a lack of legislation to meet the situation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman from Michigan know that since an agency under Sydney Hillman was created to coordinate or promote harmonious relations between labor and capital in defense industries that over 200 differences of opinion between union labor and industry have been settled with very few stoppages of work, and at the present time there are far fewer strikes and dislocations due to strikes than occurred in 1917, when this country was actually at war? So the situation today—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I have 5 additional minutes? I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to go ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And the situation is not as bad as has been pictured here many times. We all agree there should not be any stoppage of work due to sabotage or anything of that sort, but it is my personal opinion that labor has been very cooperative and that union labor under wise leadership has settled most of the differences that have occurred. In perhaps one or two instances there might be cause for complaint, but I think we are making a little bit too much noise over the one or two stoppages that have occurred.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I thank the gentleman and I call his attention to a letter that he received a few days ago, a copy of which was sent to me, and which was inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I think it came from his district and in it attention was called to the fact that although the men up there wanted to work—and this was not on a defense project, and this was in the gentleman's district, and although the employer and the employees had agreed, a minority would not let a majority of the employees go to work.

This is all beside the point I was going to speak about, but it illustrates that all our labor troubles are not settled.

While we are gratified to know that so many have been settled, the fact still remains that there are hundreds of thousands of men who are not permitted to work for the United States Government on what the gentleman from Texas said was our most important job, the preservation of the Union, because a few individuals demand that those men seeking work, pay fees that they did not have and could not get.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman permit me to make a further observation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that within 2 or 3 days after he received that letter that strike was settled amicably and the plant is in full operation now? So that if Congress had stepped in, probably it would have delayed the settlement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine. There was no justification for one group preventing, by force, the majority from working.

RACKETEERS DELAY DEFENSE PROGRAM, ADD TO ITS COST—EVIDENCE SUPPORTING CHARGES OF WASHINGTON STAR'S REPORTER, ROBERT BRUSKIN, AVAILABLE

On November 20, the Washington Star published a story by Robert Bruskin to the effect that men seeking work as carpenters at Fort Meade, Md., were required to pay tribute to and join a union before they could go to work on a Government defense job. The reporter also stated that the union made no inquiry as to the applicant's qualifications as a carpenter.

Later, at the demand of a union official, the Star retracted the statement that no inquiry was made as to an applicant's qualifications for his job. However, several men living in the vicinity of Washington have either told me or written me to the effect that they knew of men working at Fort Belvoir and on other Government defense projects as carpenters who never had been carpenters and who could not qualify as such.

#### GOVERNMENT PERMITS RACKETEERING

No denial was made of that portion of the reporter's statement which alleged that men seeking to exercise their constitutional right to work were denied that right until they had crossed the palm of the union official with folding money. In fact, union officials admit the practice, although they do not cite any law or moral reason which justifies it.

The practice of the unions is just another form of racketeering. There would seem to be no reason why those extorting this money should not be indicted for conspiracy to defraud and for a conspiracy to interfere with the national-defense program.

#### DEMOCRACY ABROAD—NOT AT HOME

While this country is preparing, through the expenditure of billions of dollars and peacetime conscription of men, to participate in a foreign war, on the theory either of making the world safe for democracy or of protecting our own freedom and civil rights, it shuts its eyes and holds its nose while right here in the shadow of the Capitol men are walking the streets seeking jobs to keep themselves and their families from threatened hunger or application to relief authorities.

The jobs are here. The men are needed. They are qualified. On one side of the street are the jobs. On the other, seeking to get to them, are the men. But in between and preventing them going to the jobs which would support them and their families and keep down the relief rolls, are these union racketeers. They deny to these men their civil rights—the right to work.

Where is the so-called Senate Civil Liberties Committee, which has held so many investigations, printed so many thousand pages of testimony, shed so many crocodile tears over the claimed denial of civil rights to strikers?

No greater hypocrisy was ever exhibited in any nation than that now shown by this administration and its agencies, which loudly and persistently boasts of social legislation and yet refuses to act when hundreds—yes, thousands—of its citizens are denied the right to work for the defense of the Government until they have complied with the demands of these conspirators, who by their demands are lessening the ability of the Government to prepare to meet the threatened invasion which the President said was imminent.

#### DYNAMITER AND RACKETEER

What is the difference in effect between the man who blows up a munitions factory and the man or the organization which bars the gates against the man who would operate the plant? The dynamiter is condemned on all hands, but those who accomplish the same thing by compelling the payment of tribute before one can work on the program go uncondemned, unpunished by the administration.

# RACKETEERING

The whole procedure is racketeering, plain and simple.

In addition to the exploitation of the workingman, for whose interests this administration claims to have done so much, there are other aspects of the situation which are essentially vicious.

## COST OF DEFENSE PROGRAM INCREASED, DELAYED

As the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] so logically and forcefully pointed out on the floor last Thursday, the procedure of some of these unions is adding enormously to the cost of the defense program and will result, if it continues, in giving us less defense for the same amount of money than we otherwise would receive. That is to say, if we have only so much money to spend for defense, we will get fewer planes, tanks, guns, ships, less munitions of war, because of the practice of these unions. The truthfulness of this charge can be easily demonstrated.

Again, the practice of these union racketeers is delaying operations having to do with national defense. When men are striking, they are not working. Saturday's press gave us the information that strikes had completely tied up lumbering operations on the west coast. What is the sense of conscripting men, sending them to camps, then letting strikers deny to workers the lumber necessary to house these conscripted men or to build the ships or the planes which we must have for defense?

## MUST WE JOIN TWO UNIONS?

Our forefathers fought to establish this Union. They fought to maintain it, to make it one Union, indivisible. Must we, as members of that great Union, join another union, give to this other union of our property, before we can work to sustain this Union of the United States of America?

If a common laborer on one of these defense jobs must join the A. F. of L. to carry boards for the carpenter, must he join the C. I. O. whose teamsters are hauling the lumber to the yard, before he can unload it from the truck?

The President was very successful in creating a war hysteria prior to election. He was here, there, and all over on his so-called inspection trips, which were merely electioneering trips. Now, safely elected, he deserts the national-defense program. He lets these strikers hold up the defense program. He lets the union racketeers rob men who want to work on that program, and he, on a Government vessel, goes vacationing in comfort and in luxury.

Nero may have fiddled while Rome burned, but the President of the United States, having told us our land is threatened with invasion, having insisted upon the appropriation of billions of dollars to prepare to meet the foreign foe, upon a conscription bill in peacetime, takes his hat in his hand, bows himself out of Washington, and once again goes on a pleasure jaunt.

## PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS IDLE—MEN JOBLESS

While the President fishes and vacations in the Caribbean Sea, while Congressmen sit idle in Washington or at home, this Christmas season men walk the streets of Washington, of nearby communities, jobless, their families with hunger or applications to go on the relief roll staring them in the face. Congress meets from time to time. It exerts itself and the sum total of its efforts is an adjournment for another 3-day period.

Here in Washington, although Congress is supposed to be in session, although there is legislation demanding its attention, Congress is no more effective than an old, broody hen setting on a nest full of dcorknobs.

## EDITOR DENOUNCES BILL WHICH WOULD PERMIT MEN TO WORK WITHOUT PAYING TRIBUTE

The morning mail brought to my desk copy of an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of December 7 last. The editor, after stating that many voices had been raised protesting against the Vultee Aircraft strike at Downey, Calif., and that a "number of so-called solutions" had been advanced, wrote:

Thursday one of the most vicious of the latter attained the dignity of a congressional bill under the sponsorship of Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN. HOFFMAN'S measure would outlaw the payment of money as a condition for obtaining work on defense projects. Translated, this means payment of union dues.

The bill means nothing of the kind. It means the end of the practice that only union men can work for Uncle Sam.

This editorial reveals a most amazing lack of information and illogical reasoning or a lapse in mental processes. The bill introduced by me and to which the editor refers makes it an offense for anyone to demand as a condition precedent for employment on a national-defense program the payment of a fee. It in no way prohibits the payment of union dues. It would prohibit under the guise of demanding union dues a demand for the payment of a sum of money from everyone seeking work on a Government job. No doubt the editor of the Free Press would be one of the first to condemn the man who insisted that before the Free Press could be sold on the street or be printed union dues or a fee must be paid to him.

The editor of the Detroit Free Press gives his support to the program which conscripts men regardless of membership in a union while the country is at peace. The editor gives his support to the action of our Government which compels all, whether he be union or nonunion, to pay taxes. On just what principle does the editor of the Detroit Free Press support a policy which requires a taxpayer, the father or the brother of a conscripted man, to pay tribute to a union before he can go to work for the Government for which his son or brother may be forced to fight? Unions are not governmental agencies. No one gives them the right to say who shall or who shall not work for our Nation. No one gives them the right to say that before a man can assist in building a cantonment to shelter a conscripted man he must pay the union tribute.

Does the editor of the Detroit Free Press stand back of that practice which holds that only union men can work on Government jobs? Just how does the editor of the Detroit Free Press justify himself in supporting, for example, the strikers on the west coast who refuse now to cut the timber, manufacture the lumber which is needed for the building of camps to take our influenza-infected conscripts out of the tents in which they have been living, which holds that no one but members of the union can work on the job?

The editor says that a bill which would prohibit a man in Detroit or at Fort Custer from compelling a farmer or a mechanic or a clerk from the Fourth Congressional District obtaining a job at one of those places or elsewhere on Government work is a vicious law.

The editor of the Press would be one of the first, would he not, or would he, to condemn the hold-up man who on the streets of Detroit took a \$5 bill from the workingman's pocket; but my efforts to prevent a union man compelling a nonunion man to dig up \$45 for the privilege of exercising the right to work as a carpenter at Fort Custer is vicious, so says the editor.

My efforts to prevent a union man demanding that a farmer or a farmer's boy or a clerk in the Third or Fourth Congressional District of Michigan pay \$25 for the privilege of working at Fort Custer is a vicious one, so says the editor of the Detroit Free Press—rot and nonsense, and he ought to know it.

It is just such half-baked editorials as this which do so much to discredit the press. Let the editor of the Detroit Free Press back up this racketeering effort if he will. He will learn in time that, no matter what you call it, no matter how you dress it up, nor how you describe it, racketeering is racketeering, and that no man in this free America has the right to demand that before another man can earn his daily bread, render service to his Government, he must pay tribute.

The editorial in the Free Press gives support to an un-American device; it gives support to a practice which is adding billions of dollars to the cost of our defense program; and it encourages those who are fattening upon the blood which they suck from the veins of honest American workers.

## WHILE UNION MEN QUARREL DEFENSE JOB WAITS

Mr. Speaker, I have been advised through the press that this morning 75 carpenters employed on the construction of the new building for the War Department, which will cost approximately four and a half million dollars and which, under the contract, should be completed by June 1, 1941, went on strike.



This was here in Washington. These carpenters belonged to the A. F. of L., and they struck, I am advised, because five other men are doing certain work connected with the erecting of backing for metal bases. These men who are doing this work on the metal bases are members of the wood and metal lathers' union, affiliated with the A. F. of L., and the A. F. of L. carpenters, who do not belong to the wood and metal lathers' union, are determined that members of their union shall do the work. The carpenters are getting \$1.62½ per hour, the union scale; and, so far as I know, they have no complaint as to wages, hours, working conditions, or non-union men being employed on the job.

In addition to the authority to compel all who work upon the job to pay dues to a union for the privilege of working, they have now gone one step further, and they have decided that they shall parcel out the work, distribute the jobs, tell each man what part of the work he shall do. They have assumed, in addition to the duty of carpenters, not only the power to levy tribute but to act as construction foremen.

Let the people of Washington thank the good Lord that these carpenters did not decide that this new War Department should be erected in the central part of Michigan, where men stand ready to work for half or less than the sum demanded by these men.

Here is a four and one-half million dollar Government job for the War Department held up because the union men cannot decide who of their number is to do the work. They are all union men, and they are holding up our defense while they quarrel among themselves as to which one is to do a particular job.

If the majority party, upon which rests the responsibility for ending the intolerable situation which confronts us, will not act, we of the minority should let the people know who is responsible for the inaction.

#### NEED FOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

The need for a committee to investigate this denial of work to our citizens, this levying of tribute without legal or moral authority and to recommend remedial legislation is apparent from what has been printed in the public press, from the excerpts from letters which have heretofore been placed in the RECORD and from the statements which are appended hereto.

Let me repeat some of the statements which have been made to me and are contained in these communications.

#### FAIRFAX CARPENTER PROTESTS

Last Friday, December 6, Mr. L. B. Burkholder, of Fairfax, Va., who said he lived in the congressional district of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, came into the office to relate his experience. He said he was a contractor and had an opportunity to build three homes but that because of the increase in price of materials, common pine framing having advanced from \$28 to \$47.50 per thousand, the owners were unable to go ahead with their plans.

Five of his carpenters were out of work and when he took them to Fort Belvoir seeking work, he was advised by the officer in charge that they could be given jobs only if they joined a union and was directed to the office of the union in Washington, where he was told that the men would have to pay \$27.10 each in order to get a work permit and that \$25 more would have to be paid within 2 weeks.

#### QUALIFICATION NOT REQUIRED TO GET JOB AS CARPENTER

Mr. Burkholder, referring to the statement of the union representative as printed in the Washington Star to the effect that men must have experience as carpenters, said he did not know about the situation at Fort Meade, which was the place visited by the Star reporter but that he did know personally men who were working as carpenters at Fort Belvoir who had been working there for 3 weeks and never had experience as carpenters before going on the job.

Mr. Burkholder further said that he would like to have explained to him a situation which permitted men, denying work to American citizens, until their demands for money had been met, while at the same time men were taken from the same vicinity, yes, from the same community, for services with the Army.

#### HEAD OF WEST VIRGINIA FAMILY OF NINE LACKS FEE SO CANNOT WORK

Friday, December 6, a man who gave his name, who said he was from Bayard, W. Va., called at the office. He said he was a carpenter; that he had belonged to the union until 1931, then dropped out because there was no union where he then lived; that on December 4 he applied for work at Fort Belvoir; was told that he must join a union. He went to the office of the carpenters' union at Tenth and K Streets NW., and asked for a permit to work. He was advised that, because he had dropped out of the union, he would have to pay a fine of \$25 and that the fee for joining was \$57.50, of which \$37.50 must be paid before he could have a permit, although the balance might be paid later.

#### MUST PAY CASH FOR PERMIT TO WORK

This gentleman stated that he told the union officials that he could not pay the \$37.50 or the fine because he did not have the money, but that he would agree that they might take it out of his pay check, but to this they would not consent.

This man is married. He has in his home five children, two grandchildren. He is out of work. Yet he cannot go to work, although there is a Government job which needs him, because the union will not permit him to do so until he meets its demand for money—a demand which it has no right to make.

Listen to this from a letter written December 3 by a Washington resident:

#### STEAM FITTER WANTS JOB

DEAR SIR: I am writing from my experience trying to secure a position on one of the defense projects.

I am a steam fitter; was employed at \* \* \* up to \* \* \* when we finished up there. My rate was \$1.65 per hour, the Government rate. Since then I have visited three of the largest defense projects the Government is building. I find everything closed so tight it is impossible to get work unless you are a union man.

When I failed to get work at my trade, I tried to get a laboring job; was refused unless I join the union and pay \$58 to get a job as a laboring man—as I have a family and owe a doctor bill and I am willing to do any kind of work I can to support my family.

I am only one of many honest men walking the streets while the unions hold a cane over us on the Government work that is needed so much at the present time.

I have worked 17 years in the Federal Government and my rating has always been high, so I have never given any attention to join the union.

I believe, if the Government should investigate, they would find cause to change things so all who are qualified could help and not give all to the unions. We are all American-born mechanics trying to make an honest living.

Please don't give out my address; might cause me to miss a job.

#### RACKETEERING AT FORT EDWARDS

I realize that open letters to the public often are none too accurate, though the writers have no intention of making misstatements.

The Boston Herald is a great daily of wide circulation. Because I do not believe it would print a libelous statement or a statement that had no foundation, I am going out on a limb and print here a clipping from that paper, which, so far as I know, has not been contradicted.

I am sure that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] who has served his district and State so long and so efficiently, can and will, when opportunity offers, if the statements in this letter are not correct, give us the truth in his own entertaining and convincing manner.

The article reads as follows:

#### CAMP EDWARDS, AS I SAW IT

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

From time to time various articles have appeared in the Boston papers dealing with the situation at Camp Edwards. To the best of my knowledge, none of the men actually employed there have "aired" their experience by means of the press. I worked there as a carpenter from October 9 to November 19, inclusive.

It is undoubtedly well known that the applicant for a carpenter's job was required by the local union (New Bedford in this case) to pay an initial fee of \$25 and was allowed 30 days to pay the balance of \$50, making a total of \$75. There were no questions asked whether or not the applicant had ever had any previous experience as a carpenter—merely a terse question as to whether he cared to risk paying his money. It mattered not to the officials there that possibly the closest previous acquaintance a man may have had of the tools required was possibly a casual glance in their direction in some hardware shop.

My number was in the 9,000 bracket. (Three weeks later, the 20,000 number had been issued.) Is it any wonder that buildings

appeared to spring up like mushrooms? Imagine, if you will, what might have been accomplished had there been in force the efficiency of the auto assembly line. Yes, I've read the recent article comparing it to such.

Seldom, if ever have I worked any harder, or more earnestly, than I did during the first 2 weeks on the job; and I've been around a bit also; the Pontiac assembly line in Michigan, the Portland Cement Co. in Dayton, Ohio; a bronze-casting company, a steel-casting company in Massachusetts; landscape architect in Florida, lumberman, farmer, soda jerker, photographer, and what have you. This was the first time our foreman had ever enjoyed his exalted position, and believe you me, he really enjoyed his superior rank.

In our original "crew" there were some 12 carpenters, two laborers, and the foreman. The first barrack was finished in 7 days, with the exception of putting in the floors, the novelty sidings, partitioning off several smaller rooms, putting in the sheet-rack, doors, windows, and several other finishing details.

All of this could have been accomplished in 7 or more days with our personnel. In other words, it required 15 men 14 days to completely finish one barrack. At this rate, it would require 10,000 men to finish the 1,200 barracks in exactly 25 days.

Work was started at the camp about the middle of September, and we are told by the latest news releases that it may extend until the middle of February, or possibly later, should the present force of 14,000 men be kept intact. True, there are a hospital site, warehouses, roads, mess halls, etc., included as part of the job, but by far the largest item was the construction of the barracks. How to account for this mathematical discrepancy?

Our second (and last) barrack was started on the 17th of October and we left it almost completely finished on the 18th, losing 4 days due to the rainy spell. The "crew" on this barrack reached as high as 30 men and, I believe, a safe daily average was in the vicinity of 20 men.

You guessed it; the last 2½ weeks we all enjoyed a beautiful vacation for which you, our generous taxpayers, were paying us a cool \$60 per week. Oh, yes, should any casual reporter or observer happen to pass along, he would discern plenty of activity. Somebody was always sawing a board, driving a nail, or shouldering a plank. Apparently a hive of activity.

During this period I had several talks with some other foremen and they likewise reported that they did not know what to do with themselves or their men except to advise them to appear busy. The attic made a very convenient habitat for unknown hundreds of men.

This pathetic waste of time, and money, went hand in hand with the waste of materials. Lumber and nails were treated as though worthless. In spite of this deplorably evident loss, no reprimand or caution, or threat was audibly uttered by those whose business it was to do so. As a matter of fact, I sincerely believe that they desired it thus. Why? Well, I have my suspicions, but at present they are only suspicious.

A short time after I'd paid my union fee in full, I was handed my pink slip stating no cause for discharge. It may have been only a coincidence in my one case that I got it then, but was it also only a coincidence that the majority of the "pink slip" receivers also were handed theirs after they'd paid in full? As one old-time carpenter expressed it, "The W. P. A. wasn't even in the same class as this."

If this open letter to the public can evoke some thought and serious research as to the manner in which our money is being used in the name of national defense, I will have felt amply repaid.

ANTHONY DE LORENZO,  
M. I. T., '33.

KINGSTON.

#### TEN THOUSAND MEN MUST PAY IF THEY WORK

The Army's new seventh corps cantonment is to be built in Pulaski County, Mo. Mr. Tom McFarland, secretary of the Central Labor Union, is quoted in the Springfield Leader and Press of December 5, as follows:

This means, McFarland explained, that any employee at the camp in any craft over which the Springfield unions have jurisdiction, must, if he is not already a union man when he is employed, either obtain a work permit from the union here or become a regular member of the union here.

"That," said McFarland, "will mean considerable financial aid to the unions here. It will let us participate in the boom which will hit the whole town as a result of the camp."

McFarland said Neuman estimated 10,000 or more men would be employed at the camp when the construction program reaches its peak.

The gentleman who sent in the foregoing wrote:

Why should we be compelled to pay a large sum of our earnings to only be benefited for such a short time and when this job is completed, we will have no jobs to pay our union dues, and then we are kicked out of the local.

The same thing has been done here various times before, and the union and contractor has worked hand in hand and discharged the men and give them no union protection and hired a new bunch and compelled them to join.

#### LAY IT ON THE LINE

Representative HOFFMAN (Republican, Michigan).

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in the sense of backing up the article in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., as of Monday, December 2, 1940.

Subject: Unfair labor conditions in defense work.

Now this letter is not written with malice, in fact, quite the opposite, and the following is absolutely true:

First. I am a plumber and steamfitter for over 20 years, now 44 years of age, healthy, strong. For the past 6 months I have covered the eastern seaboard from New York to Washington applying for work; failed due to the fact I have not the money to lay on the line as the A. F. of L. demands.

To begin, Fort Belvoir and Fort Meade are exactly as your article in the Evening Star states, plus the fact that after you pay your union initiation fees and dues, you stand a good chance of getting laid off.

A racket—nothing more.

Second. Federal Shipyard & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J.: Application filed; waited 5 days at employment gate and learned you need a letter from Mayor Hague, of Jersey City, to get to work. Well, try and get the letter.

Third. New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J.: Application filed 4 months ago; no response as yet.

Fourth. Brooklyn Navy Yard: Application filed 2 months ago; no response as yet.

Fifth. Sun Ship & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.: Application filed 3 months ago; no response; appeared in person at employment office four times, and same sign in the door reads, "No help wanted," although every hour a guard steps out in the waiting crowd and asks if you have a letter; if so, you go in. The letter is from "McClure," political boss of Delaware County, Pa. Try and get the letter.

6. Three weeks ago I was given a job by contracting painter on Bendix Corporation, formerly Atwater Kent plant, in Philadelphia; had to see A. F. of L. business agent in Philadelphia. Answer—\$10 down and \$2 per day for permit to work; this money does not apply to initiation fees, etc. No luck.

#### A \$300 INITIATION FEE

7. Four weeks ago, applied Cramps shipyard, Philadelphia, William M. Anderson, contracting plumber and steamfitter; had to apply to Local 420, A. F. of L., Philadelphia. Answer—\$300 initiation fees, 1 year's back dues, and a fine. This due to the fact I belonged to this local and dropped out in 1920. Now where can I get this money? Result, no job.

Now, Mr. HOFFMAN, I sincerely hope you can do something in this matter. I am an American, born in this country and proud of it, and, frankly, why don't you yourself or have a trusted man check on these matters? I will cooperate with you at any time or any place you may wish; in fact, will be only too glad to do so.

If you so wish, I will take a sworn statement on this letter; but, after all, why did I learn a trade years ago to have to buck matters like this when I see men working in these various plants who can hardly speak English?

Believe me, I hope you are as sincere in this matter as I am; still, I know there are plenty of men who have met the same conditions I write of, but they feel it would do no good to complain.

However, I am a resident of Washington, D. C.

You can contact me if you so desire any time. I would appreciate your not publishing my name and address.

(Name and address given.)

#### WASHINGTON CAB DRIVER PROTESTS

WASHINGTON, D. C., Friday afternoon.

Mr. CLARE HOFFMAN.

DEAR SIR: In regards to the working conditions at Fort Belvoir, Va. I drive a cab here in Washington. On Wednesday night, 4th, Picked up Mr. ———, supervisor of the hospital area. While talking to him on our way to Fort Belvoir I asked him for a job. He told me to be down here (Fort Belvoir) at 7:30, he would put me to work as a laborer. The next morning at 7:30 I was there, and he gave me an order (which I am enclosing) to go to union representative at Fort Belvoir to get a labor card. The representative told me they were not issuing any more labor cards. I went back to Mr. ———, told him what the representative told me. He then wrote on the left corner of the order. So I took it back to the representative, and he wrote "No good after December 5, 1940," on it. I went back to Mr. ———; I told him that they could not do anything for me unless I had \$25. Mr. ——— told me to come to Washington and go to Local No. 74, at 525 New Jersey Avenue, and give them the order. Local No. 74 said that they had to have \$25 on the line. Mr. ——— told me to tell them that there was others that got in for \$5, and I wanted to, too. So they said they could not do anything for me; that they had to have \$25 on the line. Local 74 said that they were not accepting any more \$5 down; that they had some men at Fort Belvoir laid off now and were not accepting any more \$5 down until these men went back to work. I went back to Fort Belvoir and told Mr. ——— what they said. To find out for my own curiosity, and asked some of the men that were laid off did they have to work hard, and he said "No; it was cinched." One said that a bunch of them were sent out to unload lumber, and three of them hid out for 3 days in an empty boxcar and got their pay just the same.

So you see why these were laid off. Why should the union make me pay \$25 or wait until they put these fellows that will not work back on the pay roll before I can get in for \$5?

It certainly seems to be a racket to me. Mr. ——— worked all day and goes back that night and worked all night and the next day. The reason he worked all night, they poured a lot of cement that day, so he went out to see that they kept the fires going to keep the cement from freezing so they could keep the work going, but him trying and the union won't let a person work that will work unless



they pay \$25 seems to be a hold-back to the national-defense program, and the union seems to me to be a bunch of racketeers.

(Name signed.)

**YORK (PA.) CARPENTER DRIVES 135 MILES—IS ASKED FOR \$80 FOR PERMIT TO WORK**

Here is a letter from York, Pa.:

I have just heard on the air that you were looking into working conditions on defense projects, of which I have this to say:

On Sunday, December 1, the Philadelphia Inquirer carried a space ad calling for carpenters to work at Fort (camp) Dix, at space ad calling for carpenters to work at Fort (Camp) Dix, at Writestown, N. J. On Monday, December 2, I drove 135 miles to Camp Dix and found the job under contract to the Johnson Co. (three brothers) who told me to report to a Mr. McCarthy, who would fix me up with a union card; this Mr. McCarthy asked me, and many others, to pay him \$80 and \$3 per week dues or we could not work on the job, or to pay him \$20 plus \$3 and that \$10 and \$3 would be deducted from our pay each week.

I refused, because by the time we would have paid the \$80 the job would have been completed.

I just thought you might want to know.

(Name and address given.)

**HERNDON (VA.) CARPENTER PAYS SIX TAXES—BALKS AT WORK TAX**

Here is another one from Herndon, Va.:

I am a carpenter with 9 years' experience and can furnish you or any other one with local references as to my ability for same. I am 36 years of age, with a wife and two children dependent. I am also a citizen, and so were my father and grandfather before me, and as such I must and do pay such taxes, as personal, property, real estate, capitation tax, dog tax, etc. I also pay my share of defense tax. But when I go out to get a job I am told that I must pay some union \$57.50 for the privilege of working, of which I think is very unfair.

I worked at Camp Meade until the union moved in and demanded I pay such a fee to be a member of Local No. 101, of Baltimore, of which would be of no benefit to me after this defense work is over.

I have my application permit for Local No. 101 and a lot of other information that I think you might be interested in, such as the union setting up quarters in a Government-built office, built by defense labor out of Government material.

I would be glad, at your convenience, to come in and talk with you, and can prove everything I have said.

In the meantime, I would like to wish you luck in trying to straighten out this matter which means so much to a workingman that doesn't belong to a trade-union.

(Name given.)

**TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS AT CAMP DIX**

Here is another from Atlantic City, N. J.:

I think it is time to do something about this union racket. Some of the boys of long experience as mechanics could not go to work at Fort Dix unless they put two hundred on the line, and they were crying for good men and holding up the job. How about a treason clause in your bill?

**MARYLAND STEAM FITTER BEHIND IN HIS DUES—NO MONEY TO BUY WORK PERMIT—NO WORK, NO MONEY FOR DUES**

Here are parts of a letter from a nearby Maryland resident. This man is a steam fitter. He was hurt and was suspended by his local, whose number he gives, because being out of work he could not pay his dues. When he recovered and sought work, he was told by the business agent of his union there was plenty of work; that he was needed but that he would have to pay \$124 cash before he could go back to work; that he has had a chance to go on six different jobs but could not take any of them because he could not raise the \$124. He is still out of work, though he has been a union man with a card for 39 years. He writes:

When there was no work we would get behind in our dues and when things got better we could always pay back \$50 cash and \$20 a week until our union book was in good standing again. I have always been a good union man and have been president of the union about eight terms. I also superintended my work for about 25 years, having had charge of some of the largest jobs in this country, which I have credentials to prove same. I had charge of power house at Camp Lee during World War and also held high position with the Government, which I will gladly turn over for your information. I am also a veteran and served in the Philippines during the War with Spain. Would like to state that during the World War we worked both union and nonunion men on the same job. \* \* \* At Fort Meade boys have quit school and are working for \$5 a day; some who are only 15 years old, which I think is against the child-labor law. Don't publish my name.

The foregoing is further evidence that the Star reporter was not so far wrong. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SHANNON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. **ROGERS** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **SHANNON**. I yield.

Mrs. **ROGERS** of Massachusetts. I wish to commend the gentleman from Missouri and tell him how much I personally appreciate his putting into the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD** the remarks of His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston, regarding the war. Cardinal O'Connell was born in Lowell, now a part of my district. Lowell is extremely proud of its able and illustrious native son. As the gentleman from Missouri knows, Cardinal O'Connell is a very distinguished churchman, scholar, and philosopher, and his views always command the attention of the American people. Everybody hopes for a continuance of his strength and vigor to carry on the fight for righteousness.

Mr. **SHANNON**. What is his age?

Mrs. **ROGERS** of Massachusetts. He celebrated his eighty-first birthday yesterday. He has both age and great wisdom.

#### STUDY AMERICA FIRST

Mr. **SHANNON**. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, through the courtesy of this House, I took occasion to review historically something of what I considered would be of interest at this time, relating to the district which I have the honor to represent here and to the grand old State of Missouri and the Members it sent here from Territorial days to the present time. A few days later I supplemented that record—and it is one that Missouri takes just pride in—by a similar review of the able and honorable Members who have rendered memorable service in the senatorial Chamber from David Barton's day to the distinguished gentlemen who are representing our State in the Senate today.

I thought it eminently fitting that the records of those men, both in the House and in the Senate, should not, in these forgetful days of partisan strife and foreign tumult and disorder, be suffered to lapse into the oblivion that too often follows in the footsteps of public servants who have contributed their share to the upbuilding of the State and the Nation throughout periods and circumstances that really tried men's souls.

It was for that reason, primarily, that I sought permission to spread their names and the periods of their service upon the permanent Records of this House. But let me add to that record a brief postscript, embodying a message that occurred to me as I went back over those familiar names—a message which seems to me to be singularly appropriate to many conditions of plans and policies that are engaging the attention and the consideration of the men who, from every State in the Union, are here in both Houses today seeking to solve the grave problems that are coming before us daily for solution.

It seems to me that the time has come when we should confront those problems from a fair, an honest, a frank appraisal of them from a purely national standpoint. We are today engaged in a program of defense. We are preparing to guard our ramparts and to defend our outmost borders from threats of foreign invasion as well as from evils within our own national borders. As you all know, I have never favored war as a means of settling our national or international troubles. You know my views on that subject without the necessity of my repeating them. I look upon war as purely a destructive agency of terror and human sacrifice that never yet has settled anything.

But no one can question my views upon national defense. I look upon my own State and upon every State in this Union as a monument of freedom and individual liberty that it is our duty to defend and preserve in the principles upon which the founders of our Republic stood when they wrote our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution and Bill of Rights. It is for this reason that I stand here today to give utterance to a few warnings of danger and tendencies

that seem to me to be leading in the wrong direction, no matter in what words we gloss them over in the habiliments of sophistry, sympathy, or romantic tradition.

We have been straining our eyes too much at the far horizons. We have been tempting the youth of our land with too much of the glamor, the pomp and circumstance of the wars of the past, whose horrors have been forgotten. We are feeding up the pupils of our schools with tales of medieval days. We are making heroes of the Napoleons, the Wellingtons, the Swedish Charles, the Marshal Neys, the Bluchers, the Julius Caesars, and the Brutuses of far distant days. Our school children are more familiar with the banks of the Tiber, the Rhine, the Rubicon, the Marne, and even the beautiful Blue Danube than they are with the great traditions that surround the mighty rivers and plains of America—the Hudson and the Ohio, the great Missouri, the Mississippi, the far-flung Platte River, the Green River, and the Yellowstone tributaries of the West that contributed so greatly to the spread of our own Nation and to the glories of its historic past. How many of the school children of today are familiar with the histories of the 48 States of this Union, their traditions of growth and expansion, their spirit of liberty, and their principles of civic culture and development? How many have even the faintest conceptions of the great men in the history of this Nation's development from 13 colonies along the Atlantic to a Nation that won two oceans for its borders and vast domains of land for agriculture, for industries of all kinds, for the wealth that this Nation has developed for our preservation?

I said that primarily I had the idea of rescuing from oblivion the men who in this House and in the Senate of the United States contributed to the upbuilding of these 48 States, their railroads, their steamships, their broad highways, their manufacturing, their mines, their roads, their cattle, and their marvelous cities stretching across the land from ocean to ocean and from the Canadian border to the Gulf coasts of the Southlands.

We talk of national defense; and we have things to defend—great institutions as well as great principles. So that is the reason that I want to say today, as supplementary to that permanent record which I reviewed a few days ago, that the time has come when we need to forget for a while those old battlegrounds of Europe and Asia, those rivers of glamorous history, and settle the minds of our youth on the glories of the Nation we are now engaged in defending from the very sources of the wars and the destruction and the savagery that those old wars bequeathed to them—the ideals that produced tyrants and serfs, races of military robots, and their deified masters.

Let us impart in our schools the inspirations of our own history. Let our American students study America as one of the noblest as well as one of the most romantic and inspiring nations that was ever evolved from that old world of outworn ideologies. Let us begin teaching our children, our boys and girls, that in these very national halls of legislation there have stood throughout the decades of the past high-minded men whose counsels and treaties and laws contributed to the eternal foundations that have come to be considered the backbone of each of these 48 States and the innermost spirit of a united Republic, pledged to freedom and a Nation one and indivisible, resolved to the end that that Nation must be preserved with unity of purpose and a wise avoidance of foreign entanglements. Let us see to it that our educational institutions, from our grade schools to our great universities, implant that spirit and that respect for the men of the past who preserved that spirit in the minds of the young men and the young women of our land. Let us study America first, last, always.

See that our school children get unlimited opportunities to study their own country's history. There is a sightseers' slogan we hear often in these days of good roads; it is "See America first." That is a good beginning, but it should be followed by another slogan, "Study America first." Let every young American be taught from childhood to love his own country, to believe in its ideals, to cherish it as the greatest Nation and the freest democracy the world has ever known.

Let them get acquainted with the men who laid the foundations of our Government and maintained it and defended it

through good report and evil too, through good times and hard times, through all the evils that ever threatened its existence. Let them learn to understand the great services and the great dreams of future greatness that gave us a Washington, who warned us against meddling in Old World affairs; a Jefferson, who won for us a western empire without shedding a drop of blood; a Hamilton, who helped to frame, and a Madison, who taught us to interpret and revere, our constitutional rights; a Monroe, who sent the challenge of a great doctrine across the seas and warned us against Old World menaces to our form of government; a Jackson, who stood for unity and democracy among all the States; a Lincoln, who pledged for us that this Nation, conceived and dedicated to the cause of liberty, should not perish on this hemisphere.

I would like to know that every child and every adult who enjoys the blessings of liberty bequeathed to us by these great forefathers have become acquainted with the lives and the deeds of the men of America—not merely the heroes of wars but the statesmen who stood as human bulwarks for everything down the fateful decades of our history that gave us the Nation we are called upon today to defend. And I want them to know, not only our heroes of warfare, our statesmen in the legislative halls, but those brave souls, the Kit Carsons, the Jim Bridgers, the Fremonts, the Fitzpatricks, the Father Desmets, and the missionaries of every faith that spread across the land the doctrines of peace and good will.

At this point I feel that I should call especial attention to an almost forgotten name, because his career was symbolic of what America holds out to those who come to her shores imbued with the true democratic spirit.

In Missouri there is one name that has become almost a symbol for that word we hear so much of in these days—Americanism. He was foreign-born and yet his public life in my own State and in the Nation was one that exemplified to the fullest true Americanism and independent statesmanship. I refer to Carl Schurz, one of the most remarkable men that ever represented Missouri in the United States Senate.

The story of his life was a romantic one—and yet with all its independent elements he emerged from a country that today is held up as a tyrannical despotism.

Carl Schurz was born in Germany. He was educated in the Gymnasium of Cologne and he became a revolutionary in political life and finally an exiled refugee from his native land. Driven from Germany after the revolution of 1848 he came to America in 1852 and settled in Wisconsin. He served in the Union Army during the Civil War and after the war was over he settled in Missouri and then became in 1869 the first German-born American to be elected to a seat in the Senate. The story of Carl Schurz's public life is a liberal education in American ideals. He adhered absolutely to no party. He supported Lincoln, Horace Greeley, Grover Cleveland, and though he opposed Bryan on the money issue he supported him on the anti-imperialism issue. He championed the cause of civil-service reform, and to the end of his public career he was an eloquent advocate of high American ideals and a revered champion of unadulterated Americanism.

The Old World has nothing to teach us now, except fear and terror. The lessons we are to learn now are those which have come to us from our own soil and our own people until, in the language of Washington, we come to a fuller understanding of the name we all rejoice in—that of American. We must make it mean something to every child in this land; and the only way we can do that is to spread our country's history, and the story of its founders and preservers and defenders in books that are not out of reach on high library shelves but distributed across the land on the school desk and within easy reach and comprehension of all our school children, and sunk into the hearts of the growing young patriots of America in every State of the Union. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement showing where the money goes that we appropriate.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, heretofore entered, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

#### AIR SAFETY BOARD

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to address my colleagues on a subject on which I do not feel well informed, but I rather believe that in this instance I am as well informed as most of the Members of the House. It may be that two or three who are actively engaged in aeronautics do know more about this than I.

Last spring I had occasion to make a trip to my home district and return by air. It was a rather stormy trip, and as we left El Paso on the way to Memphis, Tenn., it was extremely stormy. We were really en route to Nashville, Tenn., but as the plane landed I was very sleepy and went to sleep, and about half past 10 in the morning woke up to find we were in Memphis, and still there, instead of Nashville. The wings of the plane had been covered with canvas and there was a coating of ice over the outside of the plane. For the next several hours the attendants in Memphis hosed hot water on that plane to get the ice off. There was perhaps a half inch to an inch coating of ice all over the plane. I do not know how much such a coating of a half inch or an inch of ice will weigh, but it will weigh a great deal, perhaps as much as a ton, because the wing spread of a plane is considerable, and the fuselage also comprises quite an area.

What had happened in this particular case was that we had run into what is called a "cold front" on landing. I am speaking in terms of meteorology. A cold front is a point at which the cold air comes in contact with warm air. In this particular instance the dew point and the temperature were equal and they were just below freezing. As you may know, it takes the conjunction of a cold body of air with a warm, moisture-laden body of air to cause precipitation in the form of either rain or snow, depending upon the temperature. When the ground temperature is approximately 30, 32, or thereabouts, and the temperature of the moisture-laden upper air is somewhat higher than that, precipitation will occur which, when it reaches the ground, will form ice. We had a terrific example of that in Amarillo, Tex., not long ago when the trees became so coated with ice that all of the branches broke off and it laid the countryside to waste. That particular cold front and warm upper air remained stationary in Amarillo for such a period of time that a very heavy coating of ice ensued.

In this accident that occurred to an air liner in Chicago something similar happened. A cold front was approaching Chicago. The upper air was warm and moist and the lower air was cold. When a plane or anything else finds itself in that peculiar position then ice is bound to form on it, and it can form extremely quickly. It takes very little time for a considerable coating of ice to form on a plane.

We have in the Civil Aeronautics Authority inspectors whose duty it is to go about inspecting the air-line operations offices and also to ride the planes. It is their duty to see that the regulations are lived up to, that minimum operating conditions are observed, and that flights are not made in dangerous weather; that the pilots and equipment are in good condition and that the organization generally is on its toes. There is a great body of regulations which these people must follow.

Now, it may be because of the abolition of the Air Safety Board, or it may be because of the extensive program for civil-aeronautics training which we have dumped onto the Civil Aeronautics Authority, but it seems from the meager information I can find that these inspectors are fewer and farther between on the air lines today than they were last spring.

Certain pilots of air lines have called me to say that whereas inspectors were very much in evidence prior to July 1 last, nowadays they rarely see them. You can understand in any air-lines operations the pilot first goes into the room

where they have weather maps and the weather information and examines the weather conditions through which he is to fly. Before he lays out his flight plan he receives all of the available information. If the management of the air line gives him clearance to point of destination, then it is up to the pilot to decide whether or not he will make the trip. You can see that there is a tendency as times goes on for the management to say, "Well, we have made 10,000 or 40,000 trips into this particular destination; and although there is a cold front approaching or there may be some intermediate bad weather, we believe that the pilot can make a successful trip and a successful landing; consequently we will give clearance to the pilot to point of destination." If he happens to be scheduled to go through dangerous weather or into dangerous weather at the other end of his trip, it becomes a matter of daring on the part of the pilot whether or not he will actually take off.

These pilots are paid on the basis of a certain amount in base pay and a certain amount for trip mileage. Whenever he cancels a trip he loses his trip mileage. Whenever the company cancels a trip it loses all of the income that might come from such trip. There is always a strong tendency on the part of the management to want to make their scheduled trips, as the people who have bought tickets are anxious to get to their destinations, and the pilot wants to make the trip because otherwise he loses his mileage pay.

When there comes a relaxation of vigilance on the part of inspectors and the Civil Aeronautics Authority, there is a tendency on the part of first management and then pilots to go a little beyond what may be considered proper prudence and good judgment. They will take some perhaps unnecessary chances—that is, they may not be unnecessary but they certainly are in some respect unwise.

In the case of this crash at Chicago it was known that a cold front was advancing from the north. As a matter of fact, one of the air lines in the early afternoon had stopped all of its flights west of Pittsburgh. Detroit operations were closed down on account of the cold front; yet, at 6 p. m., we find planes flying into Chicago under exactly those conditions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Member of this body relays to me first-hand from an eyewitness the information that when this plane hit the ground it had perhaps as much as an inch of ice on it, which may have weighed a ton. In other words, as he dropped his landing flaps to slow down the plane, and those landing flaps act like brakes, and as his air speed slowed down, then the plane plummeted to the ground on account of its excess weight. That is a matter for the Civil Aeronautics Authority and its inspectors in the Division of Inspection to determine. I merely relate what a Member of this House told me he received first-hand.

In discussing the Air Safety Board it is not with any sense of "I told you so" or any sense of saying that somebody was wrong in the first instance when the House refused to reject Reorganization Plan No. IV, which abolished the Air Safety Board, but it comes at this point as a matter of common good judgment to the Members of the House whether we should not consider the reinstallation of the Air Safety Board into the Civil Aeronautics set-up. That board stood absolutely independent—as stiff as a rock—between the pilots and the management, and between the pilots and the Civil Aeronautics Authority inspectors themselves, ready to place the blame for any accident that may have occurred definitely upon the real source of the lack of judgment or the violation of the regulations that brought it about.

It is a curious thing, but when you take out from this set-up that independence and place the subject of accident investigation in the Department itself, there is a natural tendency

on the part of the investigators to whitewash the Department. I mean, they do not want the onus to lie on their own immediate heads. But this is too important a matter to fool with, because it is not only civil aeronautics that is involved in this question; there is also the military and naval aeronautics involved, and the lives of a great many thousands of people.

The other day I made bold to introduce a resolution asking for an investigation of these three accidents that have occurred since July 1 last, with a view not only to examine the causes of the accidents themselves but to examine into all questions related thereto. The select committee proposed may have to investigate the subject of the Air Safety Board and the effect of its abolition; it may have to go into the necessity for additional weather information and more prompt dissemination of that information; it may have to go into the subject of a bit sterner rules on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the handling of operations for aircraft, and it may run into a number of other related subjects. However, there is still time. We can be working on this between now and the 3d day of January. Although I realize that many Members want to go home for Christmas and the holidays, I expect to be here for Christmas, and others expect to be here also. It may be that the program of the majority would not allow such a thing, yet I believe that expedition at this point is very highly important.

The matter is hot at the moment. It will have cooled down later on, and until another accident occurs nothing will be done about it. I therefore suggest to the leadership of the majority that they consider taking up this important matter at the earliest possible date and getting this investigation started. It is not meant to be a fishing expedition or a witch hunt; it is meant merely to find out the truth and do the best possible thing we can to improve and promote civil aeronautics. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in a recent issue of the California State Bar Journal, prepared by a constituent of mine, on leading cases construing emergency legislation during the last World War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet the following Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, December 6, 1940, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6324. An act to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, December 12, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2064. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a supplemental report by the Secretary of the Navy for the

period commencing with June 28, 1940, and ending with September 30, 1940, on contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 8 (b) of Public Act No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2065. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting draft of a proposed bill which would permit the United States Attorney and the assistant United States attorneys of the District of Columbia to reside within 20 miles of their district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2066. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of February 14, 1931, as amended, so as to permit the compensation on a mileage basis of civilian officers or employees for the use of privately owned airplanes while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 658. A bill for the relief of Dr. B. L. Pursifull, Grace Pursifull, Eugene Pursifull, Ralph Pursifull, Bobby Pursifull, and Dora Little; without amendment (Rept. No. 3108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 10720 (by request). A bill to provide funds for the national defense; to prevent avoidance of taxes by unlimited investment in advertising; to control uneconomic advertising expense engaged in by the liquor, tobacco, and luxury trades; to discourage advertising on the public highways and to derive revenue therefrom; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. J. Res. 621. Joint resolution authorizing the President to set aside February 16, 1941, as Pan-American Unity Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 10721. A bill for the relief of Francis I. Reubish; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 10722. A bill granting a pension to Eva L. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 19, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, before whom the nations are as the dust of the balance, who hast put down the mighty from their seat and hast exalted the humble and meek: We bless Thee for all the channels of Thy grace, for joy and pain, freedom and necessity, sunshine and rain, sickness and health; yet most of all we bless Thee for the tender ministries of human love, for the love that binds man and woman, for the unselfishness of parents, for the confidence of little children, and for the encouragement of friends. As Thou hast blessed us, so do Thou quicken within us a deep sense of penitence for the foulness of our cities, the shame of our streets, and the misery of the poor. Let the flood of Thy